

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/561,941		INUO, TAKESHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Keith Vicary		2183	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Keith Vicary.

(2) Walter K. Robinson.

**Date of Interview:** 21 May 2009

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Previously made rejection*

Claims discussed:

*1, 5-18, 20-22*

Prior art documents discussed:

*No specific prior arts*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Eddie P Chan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2183

**Status of Application:** RCE filed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 3:00 PM EST

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On a previous date, examiner contacted applicant to convey that he believed that the claims were close to being in condition for allowance. Applicant conveyed to examiner that he was open to the possibility of an examiner's amendment. Examiner e-mailed to applicant a proposed examiner's amendment, along with a summary of the considerations upon which the proposed examiner's amendment was drafted. These considerations included: 1) Alleviated a written description issue: the original disclosure does not appear to disclose that the same electronic computer which executes the application program also executes the program which divides the application program. 2) Reworded several limitations to more concisely convey the invention 3) Overcame indefinite/written description issues regarding "program" by differentiating between the program that creates a logic circuit, and the program which divides the application program. 4) Amended intended use limitations which did not necessarily have patentable weight. 5) Other small changes to overcome possible indefiniteness issues. Applicant conveyed to examiner that he would contact his client and let examiner know once that was done. Applicant later called examiner on 5/21/2009 to approve the examiner's amendment, which is attached. Applicant later approved an additional small change to lines 5-6 of claim 1 on 6/1/2009.

KV